

broader American society had finally turned the tide in its long battle against illegal drugs. Studies by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, for instance, showed that drug use among high school seniors declined gradually but steadily through the second half of the 1980s and into the 1990s. Not coincidentally, perceptions that regular drug use was risky rose through the same period.

Now, those comforting trendlines have turned. The University of Michigan research shows that illicit drug use has been rising, slowly but clearly, among eighth and 10th graders and high school seniors in each of the last two years. Particularly alarming was the rise found in the use of marijuana. Over the past two to three years, the share of students reporting use of marijuana at least once in the past year has doubled among eighth graders, grown by two-thirds among 10th graders, and jumped by 40% among high school seniors.

The rise in marijuana use is particularly troubling, because historical trends show that marijuana is a "gateway" drug often leading to other drugs. Recent studies by Columbia University's Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, or CASA, document a link between marijuana, as well as alcohol and tobacco, and later cocaine use. To put a grim human face on the latest statistics, CASA estimates that the jump in youthful marijuana use means 820,000 more young Americans will try cocaine in their lifetime, and that 58,000 of them will become regular cocaine users as adults.

Why is this happening? The best guess is the broadest one. The country is letting down its collective guard.

For starters, society generally has stopped pounding home the theme that drugs are dangerous, meaning that a whole new set of young Americans isn't getting the same kind of clear signal their older brothers and sisters did. "The message is getting mixed," frets Joseph Califano, the former health, education and welfare secretary and CASA's chairman. "It's everything from the fact that we're starting to see pot come back to the movies and the music business, which are incredibly important to young people, to the fact that Jocelyn Elders is sending out an ambiguous message."

Surgeon General Elders has just departed, of course, so now it's up to President Clinton and his administration to undo any damage her casual remarks about possible drug legalization may have done. But the problem is hardly confined to the Clinton administration. Congress is equally complicit in toning down the anti-drug message.

In the budget he presented for the current fiscal year, Mr. Clinton proposed spending \$659.2 million on a program to help ensure safe and drug-free schools. Congress last year chopped that request down by 27%, to \$482 million.

Now comes the new Republican Congress, which will be torn between its budget-cutting impulses and the painful fact that programs to interdict drugs and prevent their use cost money. This is one area where anti-crime bromides alone won't suffice. Some in the drug-fighting community are particularly worried that, as spending on federal social programs gets packed into block grants and shipped out to the states, drug-fighting will get pushed to the back of the line of competing claims.

For his part, Mr. Bennett suggests that existing federal and state law-enforcement money could be used for a "targeted, intense effort at closing down drug markets in the cities." The first battle, though, isn't against drug dealers. It's against creeping national complacency.

For starters, society generally has stopped pounding home the theme that drugs are

dangerous, meaning that a whole new set of young Americans isn't getting the same kind of clear signal their older brothers and sisters did. "The message is getting mixed," frets Joseph Califano, the former health, education and welfare secretary and CASA's chairman. "It's everything from the fact that we're starting to see pot come back to the movies and the music business, which are incredibly important to young people, to the fact that Jocelyn Elders is sending out an ambiguous message."

Surgeon General Elders has just departed, of course, so now it's up to President Clinton and his administration to undo any damage her casual remarks about possible drug legalization may have done. But the problem is hardly confined to the Clinton administration. Congress is equally complicit in toning down the anti-drug message.

In the budget he presented for the current fiscal year, Mr. Clinton proposed spending \$659.2 million on a program to help ensure safe and drug-free schools. Congress last year chopped that request down by 27%, to \$482 million.

Now comes the new Republican Congress, which will be torn between its budget-cutting impulses and the painful fact that programs to interdict drugs and prevent their use cost money. This is one area where anti-crime bromides alone won't suffice. Some in the drug-fighting community are particularly worried that, as spending on federal social programs gets packed into block grants and shipped out to the states, drug-fighting will get pushed to the back of the line of competing claims.

For his part, Mr. Bennett suggests that existing federal and state law-enforcement money could be used for a "targeted, intense effort at closing down drug markets in the cities." The first battle, though, isn't against drug dealers. It's against creeping national complacency.

## HONEST WORK EQUALS JUST REWARD

**HON. EARL F. HILLIARD**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the issue of welfare, specifically, reforming our welfare system. How can we, as a Congress, and as a society, make welfare reform work?

I'll tell you how—by paying people a livable wage. Individuals must be able to earn a decent wage for a day's work. We have to pay our workers enough to live on, enough to keep themselves and their families above the poverty level.

Current discussion of welfare reform would require recipients to find gainful employment. Gainful employment should at least be a viable alternative, providing adequate compensation for workers and their families. The only way to achieve this is to increase minimum wage levels. If wages had kept up with inflation after 1970, the current rate would have risen to \$5.54.

I am urging that we immediately raise the minimum wage to \$5.50, and index it for inflation, in order to avoid this injustice in the future. We must protect the interest of America's working class by offering fair compensation for honest work. This is the way we take people off of welfare. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## THE DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION AFFILIATION ACT

**HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to join my distinguished colleague, Congressman BAKER of Louisiana, in introducing the Depository Institution Affiliation Act of 1995.

We are on the brink of a new century. Yet the laws which govern the financial services system which must meet the demands of that century are antiquated. They reflect a world in which only banks offered bank services; major corporations relied primarily on banks for their financing; consumer needs were simply and easily segregated into discrete products offered by distinct industries; and U.S. banks were easily preeminent at home and abroad.

That world no longer exists. Technology and product innovation have blurred the lines between various financial products and the businesses of the companies which provide them. Increasingly, individual and corporate customers have their financial needs met through new financial products provided outside the traditional U.S. banking system. Strong competition from foreign banks, which operate within legal structures which recognize rather than ignore new market dynamics, pose a serious competitive challenge to U.S. institutions in both foreign markets and our own.

As policymakers have failed to address these issues and U.S. law has remained static, the banking system has attempted to respond to new consumer demands and market developments through ad hoc regulatory adjustments and strained and unduly complex efforts by the banks to devise products and structures which might allow them to meet new demand within the limitations current law permits. The result has been a system that is excessively costly, complex, and inefficient. It undercuts our international competitiveness, limits consumer choice and convenience, and ultimately suppresses economic growth.

This cannot continue. In a competitive global marketplace, we can no longer afford to be indifferent to something as critical as the financial system which underpins our economy.

In 1991, I had the privilege of chairing a Banking Committee Task Force on the International Competitiveness of U.S. Financial Institutions. After an exhaustive analysis of the condition of U.S. banks and the challenges they faced, that task force concluded it was absolutely incumbent upon policymakers to undertake a fundamental and comprehensive reassessment of the major laws and the regulatory structure which underpin the U.S. banking system. Four years have passed and, while there has been some progress—most notably last year's interstate legislation—and much effort, the structure of our financial system has remained substantially unchanged and U.S. banks still face the same problems and constraints.

We can no longer respond to the serious problems our outdated financial services system imposes by peripheral change. The task force had a much broader vision of what needed to be done, and the bill we are introducing today responds to that vision. While this bill may not be perfect, it will facilitate a

badly needed debate addressing the basic structural problems that result from the outdated activities and affiliation restrictions in current law. I would expect there will be changes as the process moves forward. In particular, I look forward to working closely with my colleague, Mr. BAKER, to address our mutual concern that the bill ensure that a restructured system will provide international banks comparable treatment to our domestic institutions, so we can in turn ensure that our own firms are equally fairly treated abroad.

Our objective in this legislation is to create a structure for the U.S. financial services system that will allow U.S. companies to provide consumers and businesses with the most cost-efficient and highest quality financial products, and to compete fairly in a global marketplace, while operating in a safe and sound manner. It is an objective we must achieve if we are to meet the challenges ahead. I urge that my colleagues offer their support to this important effort.

### INTEREST RATES

#### HON. PAT DANNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, home interest rates are up, housing starts are down. Car plants are closing, credit cards rates are rising, and more jobs are lost.

I am alarmed that these scenarios exist in America in 1995 during this time of apparent prosperity. But for the seventh time since last February, the Federal Reserve has raised the short-term interest rate. And for the seventh time since last February, Americans will experience increased borrowing costs. We have heard many technical excuses about "cooling an overheating economy" and "curbing the rise of inflation."

Meanwhile, the people I represent are saying, "that's enough!" The Fed does not reserve the right to impose rate hike after rate hike on the hardworking citizens of my district who struggle every day to meet upward spiraling home, farm, and car payments. Most Americans who can scarcely afford life's necessities are having a difficult time believing that the economy is growing too rapidly. It is my hope that this is the last rate increase for a long time.

### TRIBUTE TO PAUL BUTHERUS

#### HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor a great Missourian, Paul F. Butherus. Last fall Paul Butherus was inducted into the Northwest Missouri State University's Athletic Hall of Fame.

An athlete, official, and coach, Butherus began his athletic career at Maryville High School. During 1940-44, Butherus was a letter winner in football, basketball, track, and tennis. Before moving onto college, Butherus served in the U.S. Infantry from 1944-46, where he was awarded a Purple Heart in the Battle of Luzon. In his college years at North-

west Missouri State College from 1946-49, Butherus was a 3-year letter winner in football, basketball, and track.

Butherus served as a teacher, coach, and athletic director from 1949-83 at various high schools. From 1949-50 he was at Madrid High School in Iowa. Following his years in Iowa he returned to Plattsburg High School in Missouri until 1958. He then went to Wentworth Military Academy in Missouri where he was until 1983.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this talented athlete. I congratulate him on his lifetime accomplishments and contributions.

### MEXICAN BAILOUT

#### HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in adamant opposition to President Clinton's unilateral decision to bailout the Government of Mexico. In response to the President's actions, I am joining a number of my colleagues in introducing today a resolution calling for a full investigation of this matter by the U.S. Comptroller General.

I am extremely disappointed that the President decided to circumvent Congress and provide billions of dollars in United States-backed loan guarantees to rescue Mexico from a financial collapse without first receiving congressional approval. The taxpaying citizens of northwest Indiana are absolutely opposed to this United States-funded bailout of the Mexican Government.

While I recognize and appreciate the problems associated with a devalued peso and illegal immigration, I do not believe these arguments are compelling enough to justify a nearly \$50 billion bailout of the Mexican Government. As someone who adamantly opposed NAFTA, I strongly believe that the United States aid package designed to prop up Mexico's unstable economy is the wrong course of action to take at this time. Mexico's problems are far more serious than a short-term currency shortage. This crisis clearly shows that NAFTA has failed to deliver on its promises of a strong and stable Mexico.

Mexico's problems are social, political, and economic in nature. The present crisis was precipitated by the Chiapas rebellion, as well as the assassination of key leaders. Mexican society is unstable, as evidenced by the recent elections, which contained extensive voter fraud. Mexico is also continuing its policy of repressing worker rights and labor standards in order to attract United States factories and foreign investors. New economic reforms proposed by the Mexican Government would reduce the average Mexican wage by at least 5 percent over the coming year, making cheap Mexican labor even cheaper.

Mexican's reforms have not gone far enough and they are now going the wrong direction. The Mexican Government is going to reduce wages of the ordinary worker, including the minimum wage, in order to help balance the Mexican budget and control the economy. Punishing the ordinary Mexican worker because of the irresponsibility of the Mexican elite is typical of a country with such a large gap between the rich and the poor.

Finally, we are setting a bad precedent by helping Mexico. It is entirely possible that Mexico will face a similar or worse crisis in the near future. United States taxpayers should not have to put up billions of dollars every time Mexico is unable to maintain fiscal stability. After all, 38,000 taxpaying citizens of northwest Indiana lost their jobs in the late 1970's and 1980's. The U.S. Government certainly did not step in to provide loan guarantees for those with home mortgages, credit card debt, or car loans.

I urge all Members to take a strong stand on this issue by supporting the resolution introduced by Representative GENE TAYLOR requiring that the U.S. Comptroller General provide a detailed explanation about the legality of the President's decision.

### CONCERNING THE STENHOLM AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2—LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

#### HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, as indicated by my submission of amendments, placed into the RECORD on Wednesday, I intend to offer an amendment to H.R. 2, the Line-Item Veto Act. Although my first choice would be to substitute my expedited rescission authority for H.R. 2, I understand that there is great difficulty in achieving the votes for that approach. Therefore, my plan is to offer an amendment which leaves H.R. 2, as amended, entirely intact and simply adds on the expedited rescission authority.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, there were three amendments approved by the Committee of the Whole during yesterday's proceedings. I was particularly pleased to see the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] accepted by the House.

In order to guarantee that I am offering my add-on to the base package which has been approved by the House, I have redrafted my amendment to incorporate the Clinger, Thurman, and Deal amendments. I am today submitting for the RECORD my amendment so that everyone might have full opportunity to examine it.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE SUPERFUND RECYCLING EQUITY ACT OF 1995

#### HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, February 3, 1995*

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation along with Mr. UPTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. TAUZIN to relieve legitimate recyclers from Superfund liability. We introduced similar language last year with bipartisan support. This language was developed in conjunction with the recycling industry, the environmental community and the Federal Government and was incorporated into the